

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are currently pending. No claim amendments have been made with this response. Applicants have included a Declaration of Jeffrey L. Armstrong as evidence of invention and reduction to practice of the claimed invention prior to the filing date of U.S. Patent No. 6,648,160 (“Hotch”). Included with the Declaration are several images of a solid model illustrating the various components of the oil tank cap. As can be seen, the images illustrate the oil tank cap claimed in the present application.

The Examiner rejected Claims 10-23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Hotch (U.S. Patent No. 6,648,160).

In light of the Declaration of Jeffrey L. Armstrong and the attached evidence, Applicants submit that the invention claimed in claims 10-23 was conceived and reduced to practice prior to the filing date of Hotch. As such, Hotch is not prior art.

In light of the foregoing, the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejections based on Hotch are moot and claims 10-23 are allowable.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hotch in view of Okuma (U.S. Patent No. 5,627,351).

In light of the Declaration of Jeffrey L. Armstrong and the attached evidence, Applicants submit that the invention claimed in claims 1-9 was conceived and reduced to practice prior to the filing date of Hotch. As such, Hotch is not prior art. Without Hotch, the 35 U.S.C 103(a) rejection cannot stand. Thus, claims 1-9 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-23 are allowable.

The undersigned is available for telephone consultation during normal business hours.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas J. Otterlee
Reg. No. 48,652

Docket No.: 043210-1542-01
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108

(414) 271-6560